DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 079 JC 800 276

AUTHOR Gold, Ben K.
TITLE The LACC Tutoring Program: An Evaluation. Research Study #80-4.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles City Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age; *Community Colleges; Departments; Educationally Disadvantaged; Females; Grade Point Average; *High Risk Students; Job Training; Males; Persistence; *Program Effectiveness; Referral; School Surveys; Self Evaluation (Groups); Student Attitudes; Student Motivation; Supervisors; Teacher Attitudes; *Tutorial Programs; Tutors; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

In order to gather opinions and data about the impact of Los Angeles City College's tutorial program, a two-part study was conducted in Spring 1979. Initially, the academic records of 477 students who had received tutoring in Spring 1979 were examined and compared with overall campus performance averages in the following areas: class(es) for which tutored, week when tutoring began, number of weeks tutoring continued, sex, age, final grade in course for which tutored, Spring 1979 grade point average (GPA), cumulative GPA, and units attempted in Fall 1979. Additionally, faculty members, tutor supervisors, and tutors were asked about their perceptions of the tutorial program. The faculty survey focused on general impressions of the tutorial program campus-wide and by department; number of students receiving tutoring and number that had been advised to seek tutoring; effects on class and academic performance; tutor training; and program administration. The tutor supervisors were asked to rate items related to program effectiveness in relation to student persistence and achievement; assistance of the tutoring office; tutor training, competence, and availability; student awareness of tutoring services; scheduling; and program strengths and weaknesses. Tutors were asked about their motivation for becoming a tutor, frequency of tutoring sessions, student referral, their impressions, and tutee reasons for seeking help. (JE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186079

JC 800 276

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE

"THE LACC TUTORING PROGRAM: AN EVALUATION"

Research Study #80-4

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ben Gold

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ben K. Gold
Research Office
April 1980

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Recent studies* indicate that almost all community colleges provide tutorial services for students. A 1976 study indicated that 85% of those being tutored said that the tutoring they received improved their achievement level, and 57% said they would have dropped out of college without tutoring assistance. Tutoring directors generally shared this perception, and the California Community College Tutorial Association stated that the tutoring programs were doing a "tremendously successful job of helping students stay in school."

LACC's tutoring program has grown from a modest beginning to an endeavor encompassing nearly 3,000 tutees, over 300 tutors, with almost all departments providing a faculty supervisor of tutoring as well as appropriate physical facilities. Tutoring funds come from a variety of federal sources as well as local and state origins. EOPS provides the bulk of the funds and also provides personnel and space for central management of the tutoring program.

The Research Office was requested by the College President to assess the impact of the LACC tutoring program. This study was designed for this purpose. The Research Office is indebted to the Campus Tutoring Office, particularly Nina Fridkis and Al Gasser, for their generous assistance and cooperation in providing data for this study.

*as summarized by Polly Garstka in "The Role of Tutoring in Community Colleges", March 1979 ERIC #168613.

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The study was designed to provide both subjective opinions and objective data. Subjective data were provided by questionnaires administered to faculty, department tutor supervisors, and tutors. The first two instruments were designed and administered by the Research Office. The Campus Tutoring Office in April 1979 had devised and administered an evaluation questionnaire to the student tutors. Selected results of that endeavor are included in this study. Objective data were provided by records of students tutored in Spring 1979. Completion ratios and grade point averages were analyzed for this group and selected subgroupings, and compared with overall campus performance in Spring 1979, as described in the next section. Raw data were obtained from the Campus Tutoring Office and the Office of Admissions and Records. District computer facilities (SPSS programs) were used to provide analysis.

FINDINGS

I. Objective Data

The Tutoring Central Office provided the Research Office with a computer printout listing approximately 2,700 names of students who were tutored in Spring 1979. 682 names on the list were randomly selected. Using the CRT terminals in the Admissions Office, together with other information provided on the printouts the following information was recorded for each: class (or classes) for which tutored, week tutoring was begun, number of weeks tutoring continued, sex, age, final grade in course tutored, Spring 1979 GPA, cummulative GPA, and units registered for in Fall 1979. IBM cards were punched for these data, and SPSS

programs were used to analyze the data on the district computer.

The 682 students were indicated to have been tutored in 911 classes, an average of 1.3 classes per student. 205 of the students (211 classes) were found to have incorrect social security numbers or other errors in the listing.

The sample studied then consisted of 477 students being tutored in a total of 700 classes. The following tables present the analysis made of the data available on these 477 students. Discrepancies in some totals indicate missing or incomplete data.

TABLE 1 - No. of Classes In Which Students were Tutored

No. of classes per student	No. of students	No. of classes
one	326 (68.3)	326
two	106 (22.2)	212
three	28 (5.9)	84
four	10 (2.1)	40
five	6 (1.3)	30
six	0 (0.0)	0
seven	0 (0.0)	0
eight	1 (0.2)	8
Total	477 (100.0)	700

TABLE 2 - Number of Tutees, Spring 1979, by Department

Department	No. in Sample	Percent of Total
American Cultures	7	1.0
Art	21	3.0
Business Admin.	39	5.6
Chemistry	8	1.1
Computer & Elec. Tech.	14	2.0
Dental	36	5.1
Developmental Comm.	27	3.9
Earth Science	11	1.6
Engr. & Indust. Tech.	1	0.1
English	27	3.9
Family & Consum. Studies	2	0.3
Foreign Language	25	3.6
Law	13	1.9
Learning Skills	143	20.4
Life Science	6	0.9
Mathematics	125	17.9
Media Arts	28	4.0
Music	38	5.4
Nursing	2	0.3
Occupational Therapy	6	0.9
Office Administration	27	3.9
Ophthal., Optics	6	0.9
Philosophy	15	2.1
Physics	6	0.9
Psychology	17	2.4
Radio, T.V., Film	31	4.4
Social Science	5	0.7
Speech	4	0.6
Theater	4	0.6
Transportation	4	0.6
. . . . .		
Total	700	100.0

TABLE 3 - Distribution of LACC Spring 1979 Tutees According to Week Tutoring Started

Starting Week	No. of Students	%	Cum. %	No. Rec. Grade	No. Rec. Grade
0	27	4.0	4.0	18	66.7
1	70	10.3	14.3	46	65.7
2	53	7.8	22.1	39	73.6
3	50	7.3	29.4	33	66.0
4	53	7.8	37.2	47	88.7
5	54	7.9	45.1	40	74.1
6	39	5.7	50.8	27	69.2
7	52	7.6	58.4	45	86.5
8	40	5.8	64.2	31	77.5
9	41	6.0	70.2	32	78.0
10	0	0.0	70.2	0	-
11	31	4.5	74.7	27	87.1
12	31	4.5	79.2	16	51.6
13	16	2.3	81.5	11	68.8
14	24	3.5	85.0	18	75.0
15	24	3.5	88.5	18	75.0
16	25	3.6	92.1	17	68.0
17	19	2.8	94.9	15	79.0
18	20	2.9	97.8	15	75.8
19	7	1.0	98.8	6	85.7
20	8	1.2	100.0	4	50.0
Total	684	100.0		505	73.8

Median start week: 6th

TABLE 4 - Distribution of LACC Spring 1979 Tutees According to Number of Weeks Tutored

No. of Weeks	No. of Students	%	Cum. %	No. Rec. Grade	No. Rec. Grade
1	486	69.4	69.4	332	68.3
2	87	12.4	81.8	70	80.5
3	48	6.9	88.7	43	89.6
4	21	3.0	91.7	20	95.2
5	16	2.3	94.0	15	93.8
6	5	0.7	94.7	5	100.0
7	4	0.6	95.3	2	50.0
8	13	1.9	97.2	12	92.3
9	8	1.1	98.3	7	87.5
10	4	0.6	98.9	3	75.0
11	4	0.6	99.5	3	75.0
12 or more	4	0.6	100.1	3	75.0
Total	700	100.1		515	73.6

TABLE 5 - Age of Tutees

Age	Tutees No.	Tutees %	All Day F'78 Students
Under 20	37	7.8	16.7
20-24	191	40.0	33.1
25-29	97	20.3	20.4
30-34	57	11.9	11.8
35-39	33	6.9	6.4
40-44	21	4.4	3.8
45-49	11	2.3	2.6
50-54	9	1.9	1.9
55-59	13	2.7	1.4
60-64	2	0.4	0.8
65+	6	1.3	1.0
Total	477	100.0	100.0
Median Age:		25.0	24.6

TABLE 6 - Sex of Tutees

Sex	Tutees No.	Tutees %	All Day F'78 Students
Male	230	48.2	47.0
Female	247	51.8	53.0
Total	477	100.0	100.0

TABLE 7 - Fall 1979 Registration

	Tutees No.	Tutees %	All Day* Students
Enrolled F'79	199	58.3	60.7
Not Enrolled F'79	278	41.7	39.3
Total	477	100.0	100.0

*estimated from Student Longitudinal Study data

TABLE 8 - Distribution of Grades Received by LACC Spring 1979 Tutees (in courses tutored), by Department
(All college-Day grades by Department also included)
(TU=Tutees, All=All Day Students)

Department		No. Tutored	No. Rec. Grade	Percent Receiving									% Passing Course	GPA
				A	B	C	D	F	Inc	W	CR	NCR		
Learning Skills	TU	143	99	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.1	1.0	3.5	41.4	45.5	44.4	-
	All		513	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	42.9	55.6	42.9	-
Mathematics	TU	125	94	5.3	12.8	24.5	6.4	3.2	4.3	33.0	6.4	4.3	55.4	2.20
	All		1992	15.5	15.3	17.6	4.1	1.2	1.6	43.6	1.0	0.1	53.5	2.74
Bus. Admin.	TU	39	28	3.6	17.9	32.1	3.6	0.0	10.7	32.1	0.0	0.0	57.2	2.38
	All		1960	14.6	17.4	16.1	5.6	1.7	2.4	42.0	0.2	0.0	53.9	2.68
Music	TU	38	29	10.3	17.2	20.7	20.7	6.9	6.9	17.2	0.0	0.0	68.9	2.05
	All		2505	26.2	12.7	10.1	4.9	6.1	1.3	38.6	0.2	0.0	54.1	2.80
Dental	TU	36	32	15.6	21.9	31.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	28.1	0.0	0.0	71.9	2.70
	All		718	20.1	27.4	33.7	5.0	1.2	1.4	11.0	0.0	0.1	86.2	2.69
Radio, T.V.,Film	TU	31	25	32.0	24.0	12.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	76.0	2.90
	All		803	21.4	17.1	15.1	3.2	2.2	1.9	39.1	0.0	0.0	56.8	2.88
Media Arts	TU	28	15	26.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	13.3	46.7	2.20
	All		489	23.9	17.0	14.7	5.7	2.2	2.0	34.3	0.0	0.0	61.3	2.86
Dev. Com.	TU	27	23	4.3	17.4	8.7	4.3	0.0	21.7	43.5	0.0	0.0	34.7	2.62
	All		1043	15.0	16.3	22.0	8.0	0.1	3.7	32.9	1.2	0.7	62.5	2.62
English	TU	27	16	0.0	31.3	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	0.0	18.8	50.1	2.62
	All		2465	5.1	10.5	14.1	4.2	0.4	1.6	35.7	21.9	6.5	55.8	2.45
Office Admin.	TU	27	21	19.0	33.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	80.9	2.71
	All		1549	11.9	20.8	19.0	6.7	0.8	0.3	40.0	0.5	0.0	58.9	2.62

(Continued)

TABLE 8 - (Continued)

Department		No. Tutored	No. Rec. Grade	Percent Receiving A	B	C	D	F	Inc	W	CR	NCR	% Passing Course	GPA
Foreign Language	TU	25	17	5.9	11.8	5.9	23.5	0.0	0.0	47.1	0.0	5.9	47.1	2.00
	All		1034	21.2	17.2	12.1	4.5	1.1	2.7	41.3	0.0	0.0	55.0	2.95
Art	TU	21	15	33.3	26.7	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	86.7	3.00
	All		1042	28.1	21.3	10.1	2.8	1.1	1.0	35.2	0.4	0.1	62.7	3.15
Psychology	TU	17	13	7.7	7.7	38.5	15.4	0.0	7.7	23.1	0.0	0.0	69.3	2.11
	All		2048	16.7	17.9	15.8	4.5	0.2	1.5	37.5	4.8	1.2	59.7	2.84
Philosophy	TU	15	14	21.4	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	7.1	14.3	0.0	78.6	2.89
	All		376	20.2	14.9	11.2	4.3	0.5	8.2	39.9	0.8	0.0	51.4	2.98
Comp. & El. Tech	TU	14	11	9.1	36.4	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	0.0	72.8	3.00
	All		778	18.9	21.1	23.0	6.4	2.6	0.4	27.5	0.1	0.0	69.5	2.65
Law	TU	13	7	28.6	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	71.5	3.00
	All		927	17.4	19.4	21.6	2.8	4.0	1.0	33.8	0.1	0.0	61.3	2.67
Earth Science	TU	11	9	0.0	11.1	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	11.1	66.6	1.50
	All		635	11.6	12.6	25.0	11.2	1.4	1.7	35.0	1.7	0.2	62.1	2.35
Chemistry	TU	8	7	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.8	42.9	2.00
	All		639	8.3	13.0	18.5	3.1	1.2	1.2	44.9	8.9	0.8	51.8	2.54
Amer. Cultures	TU	7	7	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.14
	All		662	17.5	18.1	15.4	1.8	0.0	5.0	42.0	0.1	0.0	52.9	2.97
. . . . .		. . .	. . .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. . .	. .
Total	TU	700	516	10.5	14.0	18.0	6.6	3.1	4.5	21.9	10.3	11.2	59.3	2.42
	All		38020	18.7	17.7	17.1	4.8	2.4	1.5	33.1	3.3	1.4	61.1	2.75

(others less than 1% of total, not included)

TABLE 9 - Distribution of Grades Received by LACC Spring 1979 Tutees in Courses Tutored, by Selected Subgroups.

Subgroup	No. Tutored	No. Rec. Grade	Percent Receiving									% Passing Course	GPA
			A	B	C	D	F	Inc	W	CR	NCR		
All Tutees	700	516 (73.7%)	10.5	14.0	18.0	6.6	3.1	4.5	21.9	10.3	11.2	59.3	2.42
Males	345	247 (71.6%)	9.3	14.2	23.5	5.7	2.4	4.5	24.3	7.7	8.5	60.4	2.40
Females	353	268 (75.9%)	11.6	13.8	13.1	7.5	3.7	4.5	19.4	12.7	13.8	58.7	2.42
Students under 25	321	242 (75.4%)	6.6	13.6	19.8	9.1	2.9	1.6	25.6	7.8	12.8	56.9	2.23
Students 25 or over	379	274 (71.3%)	13.9	14.2	16.4	4.4	3.3	6.9	18.6	12.4	9.8	61.3	2.59
Students starting Tutoring by 6th week	346	250 (72.2%)	8.8	14.0	14.0	4.8	1.6	4.0	23.6	13.6	15.6	55.2	2.55
Students starting Tutoring after 6th wk.	340	255 (75.0%)	12.6	14.1	21.6	8.2	4.3	4.7	20.4	7.4	6.7	63.9	2.44
One week only	486	332 (68.3%)	10.8	13.0	16.9	6.6	3.0	4.5	25.6	8.7	10.8	56.0	2.44
More than one week	213	183 (85.9%)	9.8	15.8	20.2	6.6	3.3	4.4	15.3	13.1	11.5	65.5	2.40
All Sp'79 Day Students		38020	18.7	17.7	17.1	4.8	2.4	1.5	33.1	3.3	1.4	61.6	2.75

II. Subjective Data

A. Faculty

A questionnaire containing twelve multiple-choice type questions and one question inviting comments was designed and administered to full-time day faculty. 75 completed questionnaires were returned, with the following responses:

TABLE I - Responses to Faculty Questionnaire

1. What is your general impression of the tutoring program campuswide?

	No.	%
poor	2	2.7
fair	19	25.3
good	19	25.3
outstanding	5	6.7
no opportunity to observe	30	40.0
total	75	100.0

2. What is your impression of the tutoring program in your department?

	No.	%
poor	4	5.6
fair	20	27.8
good	29	40.3
outstanding	14	19.4
no opportunity to observe	5	6.9
total	72	100.0

3. In Spring 1979, how many students in your classes received tutoring (for your classes.)

none	6	
1-5	12	
6-10	15	average no: 11
11-15	7	
16-20	3	
over 20	17	
don't know	9	
not teaching	3	
total	72	

4. In Spring 1979, how many students in your classes did you advise to get tutoring help?

none	1	
1-5	13	
6-10	17	average no: 16
11-15	9	
16-20	7	
over 20	25	
not teaching	2	
total	64	

5. In general, how did the tutoring provided to students in your classes affect their persistence in class?

	No.	%
stayed in class longer	46	76.7
dropped class sooner	0	0.0
no effect on persistence	14	23.3
no opportunity to observe/not applic.	13	-
total	73	100.0

6. In general, how did the tutoring provided to students in your classes affect their academic performance?

	No.	%
performance improved	45	75.0
performance deteriorated	0	0.0
no effect on performance	15	25.0
no opportunity to observe/not applic.	6	-
total	66	100.0

7. Do you feel the tutors were adequately trained for the job?

	No.	%
well trained	12	20.0
fairly well trained	31	51.7
not adequately trained	17	28.3
no opportunity to observe	6	-
total	66	100.0

8. How would you rate the overall administration of the tutoring program?

	No.	%
excellent	11	20.4
good	19	35.2
fair	19	35.2
poor	5	9.3
no opportunity to observe	10	-
total	64	100.0

9. Do you think the current tutoring program campuswide should be:

	No.	%
expanded	25	51.0
kept about the same	22	44.9
cut back	2	4.1
no opportunity to observe/not applic.	4	-
total	63	100.0

10. Do you feel the current tutoring program in your department should be:

	No.	%
expanded	35	60.3
kept about the same	21	36.2
cut back	2	3.5
no opportunity to observe/not applic.	4	-
total	62	100.0

11. If teaching, please indicate your department:

Music	8	American Cultures	1
English	5	Architecture	1
Psychology	5	Life Science	1
Develop. Comm.	4	Nursing	1
Math	4	Philosophy	1
Art	3	Photography	1
Business	3	Physics	1
Dental	3	Radio, T.V., Film	1
Foreign Language	3	Radiologic Tech.	1
Office Admin.	3		
Chemistry	2		
Computer Tech.	2	(24 departments)	
Earth Science	2	Not teaching	11
Family & Cons. St.	2		
Social Science	2		71

12. How many years have you been at LACC?

	No.	%	
0-5	12	19.0	
6-10	17	27.0	
11-15	15	23.8	median: 11 years
16-20	7	11.1	
over 20	12	19.0	
total	63	99.9	

TABLE 2 - Comments by Faculty

Comment	Number making comment
Tutors need more training.	6
Not enough tutors.	5
Poor selection of tutors; quality low.	5
Tutors not available at hour needed.	3
Program well organized.	3
Clerical procedures should be simplified.	3
Students unwilling to seek tutoring assistance.	2
Tutors should work with teachers.	2
Tutors too helpful; do work for the students.	2
Tutors need accountability procedures.	1
Having specific tutoring site is helpful.	1
Have a good training program.	1
There is a good reporting system between teacher and tutor.	1
Should have tutor-to-tutee evaluation.	1
Top students are asked to tutor.	1
Language problem (student) is a hindrance.	1
No opportunity to observe; don't know if effective.	1
Should have special course with unit credit for tutor assistance.	1
Tutoring program has gone downhill.	1
Should help handicapped students.	1
Tutoring program should operate out of Learning Skills Center.	1
Whole tutoring program should be revised.	1
"B" students would make better tutors because "A" students deviate from standard techniques.	1
Program needs tutee feedback to tutors.	1
Successful tutors should share ideas with less successful ones.	1
Tutors become hostile toward the department in which they are tutoring.	1
Tutors stay only two years so it isn't possible to give them the amount of training needed. Once trained they stay a short time.	1
Students test scores are up.	1

TABLE 2 - Continued

Comment	Number Making Comment
Inadequate tutoring facilities.	1
Students receive mis-information from tutors.	1
Tutors should work on appointment schedules.	1
Total number of comments	53
Total number making comments	36
Average number of comments per person	1.47

B. Departmental Tutor Supervisors

Departmental tutor supervisors were asked to rate ten items on a five point scale, and were asked three open-end questions. Responses of the 21 who completed the instrument are summarized below.

TABLE 3 - Responses to Departmental Tutor Supervisor Questionnaire

	(1) poor ⟷				(5) outstanding	Mean
1. Effectiveness of tutoring program in improving students grade.	0	3	7	7	3	3.50
2. Effectiveness of tutoring program in keeping student in school	0	4	5	10	2	3.48
3. Assistance & cooperation of campus tutoring office.	1	2	5	3	10	3.90
4. Training of tutors.	5	7	3	3	2	2.50
5. Department facilities for tutoring.	5	4	3	5	3	2.85
6. Availability of competent tutors.	6	5	4	3	3	2.62
7. Departmental faculty support for tutoring.	0	3	3	9	6	3.86
8. Awareness by students of availability of tutoring.	0	4	5	6	5	3.60
9. Scheduling tutoring sessions.	1	2	7	7	4	3.52
10. Your personal evaluation of the program.	0	5	4	6	6	3.62

TABLE 3 - Continued

Question 1. What do you consider the strengths of the tutoring program.

Comment	Number Making Comment
Tutors sense of commitment.	3
It exists.	3
Tutee can help himself by seeking help.	2
Good quality of tutors.	2
Good hours.	2
Takes some burden off instructor.	2
Students more open with peers.	2
Free.	1
Tutor interest in tutee.	1
One-to-one.	1
Tutoring Office cooperative.	1
Supportive of the student.	1
Total number of comments	12
Total number making comments	21
Average number of comments per person	1.75

Question 2. What do you think are its weaknesses?

Poor pay.	6
Too much red tape.	6
Poor facilities.	4
Program doesn's attract capable person.	4
Tutors not available when needed.	3
Poor training.	3
Tutors not adequately trained to deal with tutees emotional problems.	1
Program should be increased.	1
Lack of interest by students.	1
Lack of interest by faculty.	1
Begin working too late in semester.	1
Tutors don't communicate well.	1
Needs more clerical staff.	1
Tutors confused as to regulations.	1
Over-extension of skills of tutor.	1
Students don't know tutoring available.	1
Matching tutors with tutees.	1
Total number of comments	17
Total number making comments	37
Average number of comments per person	2.18

TABLE 3 - Continued

Question 3. Please offer any suggestions for improvement of the program.

Comment	Number Making Comment
Simplify red tape procedures.	5
Higher pay.	4
Facility increased.	3
Program should be increased.	2
Only A and B students should tutor.	2
Special training should be offered by department.	2
Tutors should be apprised of other developmental courses in improving reading and study skills.	1
Definite schedules.	1
More department control.	1
Don't have any solutions.	1
More hours.	1
No knowledge of program.	1
Improve communication between tutor and tutoring office.	1
Recruit tutors off campus.	1
Allow tutors to become T.A.'s	1
Should have occasional bulletin to inform tutors of policy changes and procedure changes.	1
Require D and F students to accept tutoring.	1
Total number of comments	17
Total number making comments	37
Average number of comments per person	2.18

C. Tutors

A questionnaire was prepared, administered and tallied by the Tutoring Center staff. Following is a summary of selected responses of 105 tutors to that questionnaire.

TABLE 4 - Responses to Tutor Questionnaire

1. What were your primary motivations for becoming a tutor? Please rank your three most important reasons.

	No.	%
Money	65	21.1
To prepare you to become a teacher.	20	6.5
To become better skilled in your particular field of endeavor	65	21.1
Your instructor requested your assistance	39	12.7
To help you with your own studies	34	11.0
You like to help people	23	23.7
Other	12	3.9
Total	258	100.0

2. On an average per semester, do you see your tutees:

one time only	2	2.0
2-5 times	17	17.2
5-10 times	19	19.2
10-20 times	21	21.2
20 or more	40	40.4
Total	99	100.0

3. Generally are your tutees referred to you by: (check as many as applicable):

instructor	85	29.9
counselor	6	2.1
by himself or herself	64	22.6
by another tutor	25	8.8
by another tutee	47	16.6
Total	227	100.0

4. Overall, do you feel that the Campus Tutoring Program is:

useless and a waste of taxpayer's money	0	0
not really adequately helping the tutees but is somewhat beneficial and should continue as is	4	4.0
helping most students that are served and a worthwhile program	97	96.0
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 4 - Continued

5. Listed below are common reasons why tutees request tutoring assistance. Please check each according to the frequency that you hear these reasons:

Tutee wants to:	(1) Never	Seldom	Some-times	Often	(5) Always	Mean Response
improve grade in class	1	5	13	34	51	4.2
get help studying for forth-coming test	8	8	11	39	34	3.8
just received test results and needs to improve	9	14	30	32	14	3.3
maintain current A or B in class	29	27	22	9	6	2.3
receive assurance of their knowledge of a particular subject	10	27	24	25	10	3.0
learn study techniques	20	16	19	30	8	2.9
get help writing a term or research paper	49	11	17	12	4	2.0
receive personal counseling instead of academic counseling	44	14	20	10	4	2.1
improve his reading comprehension	45	9	18	14	9	2.3
improve his math skills	48	7	12	11	9	2.1
create a dependency with you by constant need for tutoring sessions	34	15	29	10	6	2.4
make a new friend	47	13	27	3	3	1.9
learn how to better relate to his/her instructor	38	26	22	6	3	2.1

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study attempts an evaluation of the LACC campuswide tutoring program as it existed in Spring 1979. Many confounding factors make a purely objective evaluation extremely difficult. Among these are differing lengths of time tutoring took place, variations in ability, training, style and strategy of the tutors, the range of ability, goals, and interests of the tutees, varying conditions and facilities for tutoring, lack of consensus on the primary goal of tutoring (e.g., increased achievement in the study area, improved study skills, more positive attitudes toward college, increased persistence in college).

Although statistics relating to performance, persistence, characteristics of tutees, amount of tutoring time are presented in the study, opinion data provided by faculty, department supervisors and tutors may, for reasons indicated above, furnish the most useful information in the study.

Following are some observations on the findings of the study:

(1) In Spring 1979, tutoring took place in over thirty locations on the LACC campus. Nearly 3000 students received tutoring from over 300 student tutors.

(2) Most heavily used tutoring locations were in the Learning Skills Center and the Mathematics Department, each serving more than twice as many students as any other location.

(3) Students began tutoring in every week of the semester (except Easter recess week). 25% had begun by the 3rd week, 50% by the 6th week, and 75% by the 11th week.

(4) Two-thirds of the tutees received tutoring for one week only. 90% recieved 4 weeks or less tutoring.

(5) Slightly over half of those tutored were female, about the same percentage as all day students. Age distributions were also similar.

(6) In comparing grades earned by tutees (in courses tutored) with grades given to all day students, approximately 60% of both groups who received grades received a passing grade (A, B, C, D, CR). Tutees received fewer A or B grades however (25% to 36%) and earned a lower grade point average (2.42 to 2.75).

(7) Departments showing tutee GPA considerably below (-0.4) all day students were Mathematics, Business Administration, Music, Media Arts, Foreign Language, and Psychology. English, Office Administration, Computer and Electronic Technology, and Law showed tutee GPA above that of all day students.

(8) Tutees in Music, Radio TV Film, Office Administration, Art, Philosophy, and American Cultures showed a higher percentage receiving passing grades than the all day student figures, while Dental, Media Arts, and Developmental Communications showed a lower percentage.

(9) Comparing selected subgroups indicated, little difference was noted in performance between males and females; older tutees performed better than younger, neither time of beginning tutoring nor length of tutoring had any apparent differential effect on GPA.

(10) When considering persistence (through the semester), sex, age, starting date appear not to be related factors. Length of tutoring does appear significant however--approximately twice as many students who were tutored for one week only failed to receive a grade, and of those who did receive a grade, nearly twice as many received W's.

(11) About 60% of the tutees enrolled at LACC in Fall 1979, approximately the same percentage as for all day students.

(12) Although only about one fourth of the faculty responded to the questionnaire, 24 departments were represented and about all stages of tenure were represented. Faculty response indicated:

(a) considerable lack of knowledge about the campus-wide program.

(b) generally strong support for the tutoring program in their department.

(c) an average of sixteen students per class recommended for tutoring with an average of eleven being tutored.

(d) a strong opinion (3/4 of respondents) that tutoring improved both persistence and academic performance.

(e) some question as to the adequacy of the tutor training.

(f) a majority opinion that the tutoring program should be expanded.

(13) Departmental tutor supervisors gave high ratings to the assistance and cooperation of the campus tutoring office and generally indicated strong support for the program. Areas indicated in need of improvement were training of tutors, availability of competent tutors, departmental facilities for tutoring, and paperwork required for processing.

(14) Student tutors indicated that their desires to help people and to improve their own skills were as important in motivating them to become tutors as was money. They indicated a variety of reasons why they felt tutees requested tutor assistance, headed by "improve grade in class".

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

(1) The tutoring program should be continued, with its primary emphasis placed on encouraging the students' continuance in college rather than on the expectation of immediate improvement of grades.

(2) An effort should be made to increase faculty awareness of the college-wide program.

(3) A program to recruit highly competent student tutors should be designed and implemented.

(4) New approaches, using wide faculty input, should be used in training tutors.

(5) Additional efforts should be made to reduce paperwork involved in scheduling tutoring sessions.

(6) Reasons for the large percentage of students obtaining tutoring for one week only should be investigated, followed by development and implementation of a plan for reducing this percentage.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

28

MAY 30 1980